

Appl. No. 10/565,561  
Amtd dated August 22, 2007  
Reply to Office action of June 5, 2007

**REMARKS**

Claims 3 and 4 are presently in the application. Claims 1 and 2 have been canceled.

Claims 3 and 4 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as indefinite.

The examiner finds the language "coupler volume" indefinite and questions the difference between the "coupler volume" and the later recited "booster chamber."

The specification describes the pistons 39 and 40 as engaging a shared booster chamber 72 and that it is the booster chamber 72 which is filled via the guidance gaps 65 and 67 (see paragraph 17). It appears that different terminology has been used in the specification and claims to describe/refer to the chamber 72. For consistency, the language "coupler volume" has been replaced by the language "booster chamber" in the specification and in the claims. In view of the amendments, reconsideration of the rejection is requested.

Entry of the amendment and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Ronald E. Greigg  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 31,517  
**CUSTOMER NO. 02119**

GREIGG & GREIGG, P.L.L.C.  
1423 Powhatan Street, Suite One  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
Tel. (703) 838-5500  
Fax. (703) 838-5554

REG/JFG/hhl

J:\Bosch\R305745\Reply to 6-5-07 OA.wpd